



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

GI

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/874,073	06/04/2001	Emir Gurur	8003-391	6810

21971 7590 01/07/2004

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
650 PAGE MILL ROAD  
PALO ALTO, CA 943041050

EXAMINER

KACKAR, RAM N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1763

DATE MAILED: 01/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/874,073

Applicant(s)

GURER ET AL.

Examiner

Ram N Kackar

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 45-47, 50-54, 60-63 and 65-69 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 45-47, 50-54, 60-63 and 65-69 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. The term "the coating material is selected based upon a composition of a wafer" in claim 69 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. In this claim the coating material is claimed to be based upon the composition of the wafer. Since the composition of the wafer could change, the scope of this claim is rendered indefinite (MPEP 2173.05(b)).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 45-47, 50, 52,53 and 65-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshioka et al (US 6149727) in view of Chu et al (US 6120660) and Williams et al (US 5647953).

Yoshioka et al disclose a process chamber comprising a media delivery member (Fig 1-9), a spin chuck (Fig 1-20) and a plurality of point contact support structures (Fig 2 and Fig 3-27).

Yoshioka et al do not disclose a coating layer of silicon oxide on the spin chuck.

Chu et al disclose a susceptor coated by a silicon-bearing compound (Col 6 lines 48- 60) like silicon dioxide (Col 12 claim 5). The thickness of the coating is disclosed to be 0.5- 2.0

Art Unit: 1763

micron (Col 7 lines 18-19). Chu et al also teach that a silicon-bearing compound for protective layer is especially useful when a silicon substrate is used (Col 6 line 67).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to have a silicon based (silicon oxide) coating on the spin chuck including point contact structures to reduce micro-contamination, especially as silicon is generally the material of substrates for processing on the spin chuck and increase operating life of the chuck due to reduced abrasion.

Regarding claim 50, as the material of the coating is silicon oxide its hardness is generally less than the hardness of silicon. Moreover, as hardness of coating layer depends upon process conditions, it would be controllable within a range.

Regarding claims 66-68 and the citation of encapsulation of particulate matter, Williams et al disclose a method of coating interior surfaces of a chamber with dielectric layer of silicon dioxide after cleaning and disclose that this coating step traps particulates (Col 6 lines 5-10) and left over uncoated particles could contaminate substrates (Col 5 lines 23-28). This teaching clearly indicates that the surface property of this dielectric coated layer is such as to trap the contaminants and prevent their transfer to substrates.

Claim 69 is rejected on the basis of Chu et al as well as Williams et al since the coating is disclosed to be silicon dioxide while the wafer is of silicon.

5. Claims 51-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshioka et al (US 6149727) in view of Chu et al (US 6120660) as applied to claim 45 and further in view of Lu et al (US 5904778).

Art Unit: 1763

Yoshioka et al do not disclose the thickness of the silicon-bearing layer.

Lu et al disclose a protective layer of silicon carbide less than 100 micron (Col 6 lines 21-22) enough for protection. Too thick coatings could have a problem of peeling off.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to make sure the thickness of the protective coating is enough for protection as too thick layers may not be stable.

6. Claim 60-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshioka et al (US 6149727) in view of Chu et al (US 6120660) as applied to claim 45 and further in view of Chen et al (US 5904778).

Yoshioka et al do not disclose a skirt around the periphery of the wafer support surface.

Chen et al disclose a skirt for thermal shielding around the periphery of the wafer support surface (Fig 1-48), which does not support the substrate and is of a size that the total is greater than the size of substrate.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to have a skirt of thermal shield material so as to provide temperature uniformity on the substrate support surface.

#### ***Response to Amendment***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/29/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that neither Yoshika nor Chu disclose the limitation of a coating layer that encapsulates particulate matter.

Art Unit: 1763

As discussed in the office action as above the action of encapsulation of particulate matter is obvious as is disclosed by Williams et al (Col 6 lines 5-10).

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ram N Kackar whose telephone number is 571 272 1436. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 A.M to 5:P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Mills can be reached on 571 272 1439. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 0661.

RK

  
GREGORY MILLS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700